Andrey Shvets

IDEALISM AND ITS PRACTICAL USE IN PHYSICS AND PSYCHOLOGY

We love life but in
non-existence there are also good parts.

Voltaire

Virtual reality cannot surprise anybody. Having robed in the respective equipment and having put on a helmet with a screen one can feel himself as a medieval knight who is fighting with his numerous enemies. You can feel their blows, hear their voices and see their embittered faces, you can also change games and become now an animal, now in general some fabulous character. True, this equipment and such computer games are rather expensive, it is necessary for the dress to have the possibility to influence in some way any part of the body. And now imagine that suddenly the playing man loses his memory and continues to live in his fairytale world that immediately becomes for him the only reality. And let this misfortune happen to all who played this game. Something similar happens to everybody of us when we fall asleep. And let us imagine that in that world two of them meet: both are with a strange appearance and began to argue with each other. The first man says that something strange happens to their world and this world cannot be some reality, that is, to exist separately from the perceiving man. And the other answers him, now he says I'll hit you with my beak and you will understand at once what is real and what is not. And if the first of them repeated about some computers and other worlds he would be considered to be mad. And even if he pointed to obvious absurdities it is all the same, nobody would doubt the reality of their world. There is also much nonsense in our dreams, but the dreaming man doesn't doubt the reality of everything what happens there until he wakes up. That is, confidence is self-sufficient and doesn't need any grounds, they will appear later. And then if you are confident in something so it is groundless. Because you cannot be confident on the basis of some facts whatever they might be. If only becuase any fact is a thing of the past, and with time everything can change, and the man who is speaking about the reality of our world on the ground of his confidence in it cannot cause surprise. Well, only some hours ago he was confident as well in the reality of his dream.

But let us again return to those who found themselves in virtual reality. In order to live and it's more true to say — to live in their fairytale world — they must solve all time some tasks, to pass from one level to another and so on. For this purpose they must notice some regularities in their environment, that is to be busy with science. And it would be simpler for them if they knew according to what principles in general some programs for computer games are written or if they themselves tried to reveal them, but for this they must believe in the fact that it is really a game.

Now let's turn to our world and see whether in general we can see and hear anything, that is, if we can perceive anything separate from us. And discuss at once that sense and to react doesn't mean the same thing. Otherwise we can say that a mouse-trap senses the touch to the guard if it reacts to it. And why should we sense anything if the signal from our organs of sense can change somehow the state of our nerve cells which eventually will form signals

as a result of what our whole body will react somehow. In such a way machines work and they don't sense. It is possible to do something, to react somehow, to adapt oneself without feeling, without sensing. In the nerve ending of a finger under the action, say, of high temperature some changes take place, but if we cut the nerve fibre going from it we feel nothing. Because they, changes, by themselves mean nothing, they have yet to be sensed. And let the signal from this nerve ending having arrived the head brain cause some changes in it, but again it is necessary to sense these changes. But otherwise one can say that both water and air and in general everything what changes and moves, all this senses something. In order to sense any changes caused by the signal from the nerve ending one more structure is needed that would register all these changes, that is, respective changes would occur in this very structure. But in order to sense now already these changes something else is needed, and so till infinity. That is, if to stand on positions of materialism so we have nothing of the kind by means of what we could see, hear and sense, but because it's nonsense, it means that we stand not in the proper place.

To perceive means to know. And to know the object means to identify it with what was seen before in spite of some changes. Because to train the computer to know some object it is necessary to set all possible deviations and changes in position, colour, shape and so on. Consequently in order the computer be able to perceive something it must know about it beforehand, but it is difficult to call its perception.

Programmers try to create a machine in their own image not knowing their nature and therefore all their attempts to create the computer, that could perceive that which is beyond it, are condemned to be a failure. We can perceive only that what we ourselves are. It's naturally to object to it that if all surroundings were a part of us, so in that what happens around there would be nothing unexpected for us, and we would manage everything. But try to think about nothing banishing all thoughts. In some time you will catch yourself on the fact that you think about something and cannot recall how the first thought in this series appeared. And moreover you wouldn't be able to guess beforehand what this thought will be. Thus we don't control much our own person.

Imagine yourself that our essences represent something like bubbles swooping in the incomprehensible thing, although it is clear that it is only allegory. So these bubbles don't touch in any way each other, and inside of each there is its own world which one way or another is a reflection-sign of that what happens in the incomprehensible thing. Every bubble has its own world, but they, worlds, inside bubbles, can be brought in some way to correspondence striving to come to one state. Two persons while playing the computer game can be in different buildings, but if the respective equipment is put on them each of them can see the other before him, sense his touches and so on. The essence of each of us creates worlds inside its bubble, the worlds can be of any kinds, but they are involuntary, they must reflect that what is in the incomprehensible thing. As well as the playing man, in our example, sees and senses only the reflection-sign of the second man, so each of us while seeing other people sees only signs-reflections of other bubbles in the world created by his essence. Our worlds are single-seated, and each has its own world.

All books on theory of relativity begin from the fact that if for one observer any two events are simultaneous so for the other observer who moves relative to the first one they will not be are as such. Moreover the speech is not about the subjective perception "first lightning then thunder". Both observers use all devices required for these observations. But for the first one these events are "objectively" simultaneous, and for the second one these very events are not simultaneous and also "objective". It means that we have already as a minimum two worlds in one, as we know the physical world must be single. And if there are many observers and they go somewhere? It's just striking with what easiness physics debate about relativity of synchronism in addition considering themselves consistent materialists: "there is no single

correct answer to the question about that if two events happened simultaneously or in different time moments. The answer depends on the observer's movement. Observers moving relatively each other will give different answers to this question, but all of them will be true".

The worlds being created by our essences must be reflections-signs or models-signs of that what happens in the incomprehesible thing. Therefore though they can be different they are not involuntary, they must answer three principles-properties. Such first property is causality. Indeed, what is possible to solve in the world in which nothing and in no way is connected, there are no effects, no causes? Apparently, we don't need such a world. The second property is correlativity. It's impossible to imagine anything what is correlated with nothing. The third property is universality. We must have the possibility to live our whole lives in one world even if the incomprehensible thing will change in an incomprehensible way. That is, any of our worlds is a model, but a special model, it can be regulated in different ways outside by adapting to something which is different each time, but in addition it is in the position to be by itself. All these properties contradict each other forming three pairs. The first pair is causality and universality. Universality means the possibility to change everything, but the causality requires that all be enclosed within frames of causal and effectual connections. But how can we reconcile them? And is it possible in general?

It would be sorrow to think that in our life everything is pre-determined. But if everything changes according to some physical laws, known and unknown, so one phenomenon must be followed by another, quite definite phenomenon, and there can be nothing different at given initial conditions. All our thoughts and feelings are in essence physical processes that run in our body, as it is thought, and they inevitably must follow from physical processes running in us and around us. And when any thought occurs to us so this thought is a result of the movement of some molecules, electrons and so on, but they move for no particular reason, but under the influence of some reasons, and this movement cannot be different. That is, we cannot think anything different. And this our thought was already as if programmed yet before our birth. It's rather offensive. But modern physics will comfort us: "We would like to underline a very important difference between classic and quantum mechanics. We have already told about probability of the fact that electron gets there and there under given circumstances. We meant that with our (and with the best ones) experimental devices it's impossible to predict exactly what will happen. We are able only to determine chances! This would mean, if this affirmation is correct, that physics has refused from the attempts to predict exactly what will happen in definite conditions. Yes! Physics has really yielded. We are not able to predict what would have to happen under given circumstances. Moreover, we are sure that it is unthinkable: the only thing that yields to precalculations is this probability of different events. We have to recognize that we have betraved our previous ideals of undestanding the nature. Perhaps it is a step back, but nobody has taught us how to avoid it!".

We are surprised by the fact that quantum physics proceeding from the elementary pre-requisites explains the most involved phenomena. But here a danger occurs: behind a splendid mounting not to to see a brilliant. And the brilliant here is the probability itself. We know that if to throw a coin many times, so "heads" or "tails" will occur approximately the same number of times. Hence follows a seemingly logic conclusion: the probability of occuring of "tails" is more if before it 10 times in succession "heads" occurred. However if we calculate by the formula of theory of probability it will appear that in this case the probability of occurring "tails" will equal the probability of occurring "heads". It will be exactly so in all subsequent tests, and how does the coin come to "know" in what way it was thrown before? That is, in each particular case there is nothing what organized the behaviour of the coin, it cannot fall however it likes, but in general the organization is evident. Even if in the beginning of the experiment "heads" occurred much more times so we are all the same sure in

the fact that “tails’ will “catch up” with them, actually we are sure in the fact that the probability of occurring “tails” will be higher in the given situation and until some time. But it is always the same! It doesn’t sink in. Moreover we can change the throwing man and the coin.

In the book “Science and hypothesis” Anri Puancare writes. “On the other hand it is clear that if taking up position of the objective point of view I’ll observe the known number of occurrences, the observation will give me approximately so many occurrences of black as occurrences of red. All players know this objective law, bit it involves them in one strange mistake that was often indicated to them, but into which they fall again. When, for example, red fell 6 times in succession, they again put on black, hoping for a certain win; well it rarely happens, they say, that red occurred 7 times in succesion.

In reality the probability of a win remains in this case also equal to 1/2. True, the observation shows that series 7 consecutive reds is extremely rare, but the series of 6 reds followed by 1 black is rare as well. The rarity of series of 7 reds falls into their eyes, but they didn’t pay attention to the rarity of series of 6 reds and 1 black only because similar combinations stroke their attention less”. Puancare called this mistake strange, but indeed there is nothing strange in it. We imagine ourselves all interactions only by means of forces. And if black and red occur the same number of times it means that there must be some likeness of a spring. And the more often red occurs the more this spring contracts trying more and more to balance red and black. But in reality the probability is the action without any action and organization without any organization. Therefore a man repeating his unbelief in miracles and discussing chances and probabilities doesn’t know himself what he says.

Speaking about interactions it’s impossible to recall Fermi and Bose particles, however all particles are these or those. So, all Bose particles, for example, photons, possess the extremely developed spirit of collectivism. “Such is the property of Bose particles that if there is one particle in some conditions so the probability of putting the second one into the same conditions is twice more than if the there were no first one there”. It is well seen in the example of liquid helium, atoms of which are Bose particles. Helium becomes superfluid because its atoms try to get to one state, namely, to move in the same way. Therefore the flow of liquid helium doesn’t break into unequal turbulent parts because of what other liquids possess the viscous resistance. I ask you in addition to notice that there are no forces that would force them to move in this way. Quite differently Fermi-particles behave — individualists to the core. Electrons are for example such particles. When two electrons are on the atom orbit they differ from each other by a spin. But if to try to place the third electron to them it will also be identical either to the first one or to the second one, and this means it can be confused with some other, but Fermi particles cannot admit it. That’s why there are not more than two electrons on atom orbits.

I repeat once again that Bose and Fermi particles interact among themselves without any interaction. And though we can describe these interactions these quantitative relations leave the right for themselves to change as they want. Well, if between particls acts force by means of anything so this force in order not to violate the principle of causality must answer some laws. But if there is no such force by means of which one particle can influence in this way the other so the interaction can be any. That is, in given cases the principle of causality is also observed if it is possible to set the quantitative relationship, and the principle of universality is also obeserved if nothing prohibits these relationships to be changed. The same refers to gravitation. The main principle of the general theory of relativity comes to the fact that the observer being in the closed spaceship cannot define if it moves straightforward and evenly, that is, when no forces act on the spaceship, and it is in the state of weightlessness, or if it falls to the earth in the uniform gravitation field and is also in weightlessness. Hence it is naturally to conclude that gravity is this same interaction without any interaction. In order to

illustrate it but only to illustrate imagine two buttons lying on the table which increase gradually. And together with them people increase who live on them but because forests and rivers and in general everything on these buttons will increase equally so their inhabitants will not see this increase. It will seem to them that buttons will be attached to each other. We got accustomed to think that everything interacts by means of some forces therefore if there were not forcible education it would be more natural for us to think that more massive bodies fall quicker tnan light ones. And the probability is also an example of such interaction without any interaction. In each particular case a coin can fall in any way, it's the property of universality, but a great number of such cases are subject to the definite law — the property of causality.

Let's go over to the other pair not less contradictory — universality and correlativeness. In order to reconcile two these principles it is necessary that something would correlate and wouldn't correlate simultaneously. Let's pay our attention to mathematics. In 1844 J. Liuvill for the first time set the existence of transcendental numbers. A transcendental number is the number that is not the root of any polynomial with whole coefficients. They are numbers that cannot be unambiguously correlated with unity, they cannot be written as numbers and fractions. Such is, for example, number π (pi). It can be written as 3,141592 ... and this fraction can be continued as long as you like, but all the same it will never be equal number π. Such other numbers are also represented by an infinite nonperiodic fraction and also only approximately, these are such numbers as e, ln2, $2\sqrt{2}$ and others. Thus transcendental numbers on one hand don't correlate with unity, and on the other hand they correlate because they can be enclosed within frames out of algebraic "normal" numbers, so for instance number π is more than 3,14 and less than 3,15. If materialism, as they say, is in close friendship with nature, then let it answer what for it needed such numbers? Well it might be much simpler. Later on E. Borel and G. Kantor established that "almost all" numbers are transcendental. Such "holeyness" cannot be the property only of the numerical series. The same thing can be also said about our perception. In what we see, hear and so on something also correlates between itself unambiguously and something doesn't. And if in any object there is more something what is correleated and is not correlated between itself simultaneously so such an object can be considered to be a masterpiece even if it is not made by hands.

Let's see the last pair of properties-principles — causality and correlativeness. Causality suggests that everything has its beginning, and this beginning has in its turn its own beginning. So where is then the beginning of everything? Well in order the world to begin, to work a reason is needed and for this reason its own reason is needed and so on till infinity. So on the basis of the principle of causality we have to recognize that the world has no beginning and is infinite in time. But this will contradict the principle of correlativeness. It's impossible to correlate infinity with anything. It's even impossible to imagine it. Infinity exists as a concept and correlates with other concepts. But there is no infinity in the physical world. And what to do?

Let's imagine the following experiment. Between an electron gun and a wall-absorber, on which in some place is a detector — an electron counter — a metallic plate
with a small hole is put. From time to time electrons fly from the gun the part of which fall into the hole on the plate, and some part of electrons that have fallen into the hole fall into the detector. Now if we open one more hole in the plate near the first one electrons must fall into the detector still more often as it seems at least but it doesn't happen so. It would be so if we instead of electrons used small fractions. But neither electrons nor other particles are objects in the usual sense of this word, they not continuous in time and space. So in case of opening the second window it can happen that electrons will stop to fall into this detector at all. It is quite the same for the small fraction that has fallen into the first window how many holes are opened, even 10. But it has colossal importance for electron as well as where namely they are placed. If our gun radiated waves so the interference pattern would be similar. Somewhere

waves having passed through hole 1 and hole 2 would complement each other, and somewhere they would mutually destroy each other. But waves pass through both holes at the same time, and our single electron cannot fly through both holes at the same time. He behaves in such a way as if it wanted “to disguise itself” under a wave. That is, first it must calculate how the respective wave would behave in this case, and then by controlling the flight to go to the proper place. But this hypothesis is too complex.

An event is when something appears or disappears, for instance, photon. And elementary events are those events between which there are no events but which are connected casually. In our example elementary events are the emission of electrons by the gun and its absorbance in the detector. And between these elementary events there is no electron, I ask you to note it, there is only some idea, scouring on all holes and being beyond time. But there is always a small fraction because in it some events always occur, the particles constituting it all time interact between each other. And perhaps we can say that any elementary particle is only a place in which something appears and disappears. Our example with electron shows that both particles and everything what they constitute can appear from nothing, from idea, and it means our casual world is not infinite in time. And if in our experiment we, having doubted illusoriness of electrons, equip windows with special devices that can “locate” a flying particle so the interference pattern (Fig. 1) will disappear immediately and electrons began to behave “simply” as small fractions. The fact is that in this case the emission of electron and its absorbance by the detector stop to be elementary events. And again we would like to ask upholders of materialism why is everything so confused? If to proceed from the necessity of reconciling the three properties-principles in one world so such complexity is justified.

So, each essence according to the principles described creates its own world which in some way reflects the incomprehensible thing. In what way do they interact with each other? In no way. But they as well as Bose particles trying to get to one state can create equal worlds. True, the word “equal” here doesn’t suit enough. And therefore the confidence of a great number of people is so infectious, I mean here a real, deep confidence. And perhaps not for nothing in primitive peoples the opinion is spread that photographing takes away force from them. You see, they will be judged by these photoes as ordinary barbarians, needless and pitful.

Under hypnosis a man being tested falls into the state of trance and his world stops to be something real. And what is this state? A man falls into trans when his essence is ready to change or rectify the world created by it. All our worlds are by their essence tasks. And tasks are changed in three cases: if it is solved, if it is too difficult or if it is unsolvable at all. Accordingly three ways of inducing trance exist that can be divided into three groups. To the first group refers, for example, the way with using a pendulum. It is desirable that something shining serves as a pendulum, in this way it is simpler to concentrate one’s attention. And when it happens, when all our attention will be absorbed by this subject we will appear in the world in which everything has been already solved, movements of the pendulum are simple and monotonous, that is, the world should be changed and we fall into the state of trans. There will be no such effect if our attention will be attracted by something what is around, well, in this case new unknown phenomena appear. The said method is also often used in the meditative practice; this is a long stay in motionless posture, the contemplation of any one object, many-hour repetition of any phrase or any movement, listening to monotonous, rhythmic music and so on. To the second group refers, in particular, such a method of inducing trance in which a man being tested is compelled to comprehend too large volume of information that he is not able to follow. Such world is very complex for us and also needs to be changed. I think that “the second breathing” known in sport has the same nature. In kendo there are similar methods of inducing trance when a fencer brings himself to exhaustion. To the third group refer those cases when a man faces something with what he cannot submit,

what he cannot understand and admit. If to speak about hypnosis so to this group refers the "method of confusion" when a man being tested is given all time contradictory information and instructions. In Dzan-Buddhism thinking over coans corresponds to this method, and in magic all possible, incomprehensible and confused rituals do. Coan is a paradoxical and unparadoxical utterance, if it needs to be comprehended. "Concentrate your thoughts on this coan all the time and never relax the spirit of questioning. As the questioning will be persistent and will continue, you will see that it is impossible to find any kind of an intellectual key to a coan, that it makes absolutely no sense in the usual meaning of this word, that it became absolutely flat, insipid and unattractive. You will see that you will become worried and impatient. When you will reach this stage, it will mean that the time has come to enter a decisive battle, to plunge into the abyss, and by doing this, to come closer to Buddha. Do not think that the meaning of the coan will become clear as soon as you start solving it, do not strain your mind and imagination, and do not wait that satori will come after you clear your mind from all confusing thoughts. Simply concentrate on the fact that the coan is incomprehensible and it seems that it cannot be controlled by the mind."[1]

Strong fear, surprise, great sorrow and other strong emotions are also in this third group. That is because we run into something that contradicts our conception of ourselves, of others, and about the world that surrounds us. In this case our world as never before needs adjustment. Hysteria, similar to neurosis, is a phenomenon of posthypnotic suggestion which is formed as a result of such a trance. Zigmund Freud describes a case of a young girl, a patient of Dr. Breyer, who became ill while she was taking care of her dying father. The sight of a dying and suffering person who she loved, and also the necessity to control her emotions in his presence, created absolutely unbearable conditions for the girl. That is why she was in a state of a trance at that time and needed a change of environment. In this state the mind is open to any type of suggestion or autosuggestion and any accident thought or image may become a command. As a result of this, the girl was inflicted with a number of physical and spiritual disorders. "She had a spasmodic paralysis of both right extremities with the absence of sensitivity. At one time she had the same affection of left extremities, an eye movement disorder and various eyesight defects, difficulty in holding her head, an intense nervous cough, an aversion to food. During several weeks she could not drink anything despite of excruciating thirst. She experienced speech defects which reached a level when she was unable to speak and understand her native language. Finally, she was in a state of confusion, delirium, and experienced a change in her entire personality…[2]

It is usually thought that everything living as a whole, with some exceptions, strives to survive at any cost. It is a very strange conclusion, considering the fact that any organism kills itself sooner or later. That is because aging is the most widespread form of suicide. It is easy to imagine a creature that constantly changes its cells and does not grow old. Many animals are able to change so much that they become unrecognizable. The creature that we made up could live forever, adapting to changing external conditions by means of trial and error. And it could reproduce itself when the number of individuals of a given population would decrease as is the case with some types of animals. The appearance of such creatures would be inevitable if the meaning of life were life itself. This reasoning leads us to the following conclusion: the meaning of life is in dying in time and in taking something with you into the grave. It is only a pity that this does not give us anything either. What does it mean "in time?" And why is it necessary? No one can say. And how do we differ from a dog? We think that we are smarter than a dog since we can build and sow. But no one can answer the question: is it that important? Because it is unclear what we are needed for in general. We all behave like the fool who thinks that he is better than others because he can move his

1

2

ears. And if death is what we are created for, can we consider it to be a tragedy? Wouldn't crossing the finish line be a happy event for a runner since he strived for it during the entire race? Death frightens us because of its uncertainty. Certainty means confidence. And confidence is the only thing that we have.

It is difficult to talk about the meaning of life, but one can say what the difference between humans and animals is. A man has two worlds – a physical world and a conceptual world. It is considered that a child, when he learns how to speak, associates the words that he hears with the objects that he or others are pointing to at that time. But no one can be taught in this way and the problem here is the same as in comprehension since it is impossible to go from the particular to the general. And computer programmers have understood this very well.

The origin of the conceptual world is just as mysterious as the origin of the physical world. But this is a full-fledged world and it should have three properties-principles which form pairs. The first pair that we will consider is correlation and universality. Concepts should correlate with each other and not correlate at the same time. Any concept can be represented through concepts that definitely are not simple to describe. For example, "existence," "to compose," "quantity," "whole," etc. The only thing that can be said for certain about them is that they are different from each other. If we try to describe them using examples, it still will not lead to understanding their meaning since it is impossible to come to the general by way of the particular. In this way, these concepts do not correlate with each other since they cannot be described. But at the same time they correlate with each other since we connect them in a certain way all the time in order to describe other concepts. In addition, since other concepts are formed by concepts which do or do not correlate with each other, they themselves should correlate and not correlate with each other at the same time. Plato considered such strange correlations between concepts in the dialogue "Parmenid."

The second contradictory pair is correlation and causality. Causality requires for all conclusions and inferences to come from other conclusions and inferences. But in that case, the list of arguments must be endless. In order not to permit this, any inference should have the opportunity to simply appear, without any reason, out of nothing. But that is what always happens.

Now we will take some tautology as an example. Tautology is a statement which does not give us anything now, but it is always true. For example, if A=B/C, it means B=C. Or this. First, the premises. Let's take a value which increases if the striving for progress in society grows. And let this value increase. And now the conclusion: striving for progress in society grows. The conclusion is known beforehand but where does it come from? Because nothing has happened with the premises, they stayed the same as the were before, they were no altered at all in order to disappear completely, having been transformed into a conclusion. No, our conclusion, the same as any other, appeared out of nothing but at the same time it was involuntary.

The third pair of properties-principles in the world of concepts is causality and universality. When we reason, we change and correct something all the time, come to something new in our reasoning. And in this tautologies do not help us. But if the statement is not a tautology, it is impossible to prove its truth with the help of other concepts. Otherwise it would be simple repetition of something already known in other words. How would we then come to incorrect conclusions? Computer reasoning cannot be nontautological, and that is why a computer cannot think. We prefer some statements to others but this choice cannot be justified logically even though it is involuntary (if only it is not a tautology). That is, both principles are followed. Any statement is either impossible to prove or empty and does not provide anything new. Newton's First Law is an example of an empty statement. We get confused because we had an idea of what mass and force are even

before becoming acquainted with it. For example, we often heard of the massiveness of some objects or about the strength of people and animals. That is why it seems that Newton's Law: the force that is exerted on the object is equal to the product of the object's mass and its acceleration, simply connects these independent concepts. But that is not the case. In this law, there is a different force and a different mass which can only be expressed through each other. In essence it claims that if mass is equal to force divided by acceleration, then force is equal to mass multiplied by acceleration. Is there a lot of use in such a law? Let's assume that we will want to use it to calculate acceleration which will be developed by an object under the influence of some force. First it is necessary to find out what the magnitude of this force is. In order to do this, we should conduct the same experiment with an object whose mass is known – a standard, and measure acceleration. But we would be doing the same thing if we were determining the acceleration of an object not knowing the law. Newton's First Law is a convenient system of measures but not more than that, it can be anything. And here is an example of a statement that cannot be proved but is productive: given the same conditions, the acceleration of an accelerating object is approximately proportional to the weight of the object. But first of all, it is not exact. Secondly, in a number of cases it is not true and thirdly, it really cannot be proved. It might seem to you that this rule is based on the law but everything is exactly the opposite. All physical laws and rules which do not have a probable or conditional character are tautologies. And therefore, if we know something exactly and for sure, then we do not know it well. By the way, even before the appearance of Newton's laws, people knew how to make complicated mechanisms, exact clocks, how to calculate the movement of planets using Kepler's rules and how to build huge temples. Physicists speak about the Newton's First Law as of "some type of tautology" and probably only habit prevents them from calling a spade a spade.

We think that our conceptual world exists thanks to something that is between this world and the incomprehensible, thanks to what forms this world. Just as in the physical world something organizes everything not organizing at the same time, in the conceptual world something is always present in our thoughts and makes thinking what it is. But sometimes this something leaves us and the conceptual world disappears, becoming a part of the physical world. Then thinking turns into a product of chemical and physical processes that take place inside a human body, mostly in the brain, and depends only upon them. That is thinking becomes what it should be in the opinion of materialists. This illness is called schizophrenia. Let's imagine a huge plant organized by one person – the Director, where only he knows what exactly this plant produces and what it is needed for. All others work according to instructions, each in his own place. Various questions constantly arise in the process of work that are not within the scope of the instructions. Besides, the instructions themselves need constant alteration. The Director decides these questions. Now if he leaves, the workers, not really knowing what their purpose and tasks are, will find solutions to such problems out of the blue, basing their actions on completely different thinking. As a result of this, in the end there will be a state of an organized chaos: everyone does something according to some rules, for each person such activity becomes a goal in itself but on the whole nothing is produced, and even if something is produced, it does not serve its purpose. That is because no one in reality knows what the purpose is.

The same occurs with a person when something that formed and organized his conceptual world leaves this person for some reason. Practically his conceptual world disappears and only the physical world is left. The brain operates with the words, words are what a person who has schizophrenia has left from his conceptual world. Some connections between words and perceptible images have been left, some words were used less often, some more often, etc. A person uses these established connections to think, to construct sentences, to speak. And he forms new connections which cannot be controlled but are just as rigid as

the previous ones. Practically a thinking computer also functions and that is why by studying the work of a computer one can study the behavior of schizophrenics. In time the words become more and more connected with each other, forming a rigid network which generates confidence. And confidence leads to hallucinations since we see what we are sure of.

Our essences create both physical and conceptual worlds. But what do they need it for? The worlds do not have a purpose in themselves. What are achievements in a world which can be of any kind worth and in which even self-preservation cannot be the purpose of life? The worlds are only a countdown origin, a net that is thrown by the essence on the incomprehensible. The main thing in the net is the space that is between the threads – it will be of no use if it is tangled. The physical laws and our desires are only a net, coordinates which can be of any kind.

Also just as in the physical world essences organize everything not organizing in accordance with what happens in the incomprehensible, the same way we can act not being lead by either desires or goals, that is – by nothing.

Our world and as a result, we ourselves, is only a sign, and that is why it is impossible to understand the incomprehensible from this level, but it is possible to feel more at home in it since the incomprehensible is our real environment and our essence learns to live in it by means of creating worlds. And when we are fully dragged in by a world and dreams, desires, aspirations possess us, we are like a child who is completely carried away by his game. The more we take actions that are not led by desires, the higher is our understanding level and the easier it is for our essences to adapt to the incomprehensible, expending less energy on the world created by the essence.

One can desire not only for himself, but also for others and because of this there are even more desires with all the consequences resulting from this. This happens if we love someone. Jesus Christ said: “Do not think that I came to bring peace on Earth; I came not to bring peace but to bring a sword since I came to separate a man from his father and a daughter from her mother, and a daughter-in-law from her mother-in-law; the enemies of man are his family; one who loves his father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me; one who loves his son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me.”[3] The absence of desires must entail the absence of goals: “Therefore, do not worry about tomorrow since tomorrow will be worried about its own: there is enough to worry about every day.”[4] If you do not have any desires, you have nothing to feel sorry about: “If someone wants to sue you and take away your shirt, also give him your overcoat.”[5] But if you are proud of this deed, that means you have a strong desire to be righteous. If you give to charity, it means you desire something for other people. If you give to charity, your left hand should not know what your right hand is doing.”[6] The call to love everyone practically means a call for indifference. “You heard what has been said: “love your neighbor and hate your enemy.” But I tell you to love your enemies, bless those who damn you, help those who hate you and pray for those who hurt and persecute you.”[7] An even attitude toward everything is necessary in order to enter God’s Kingdom, which is the same as enlightenment or satori in Buddhism. “God’s kingdom is similar to a treasure that was hidden in a field and that was found by a man, hidden, and because of the joy he feels about what he found, he goes and sells everything he has to buy that field.”[8]

3

4

5

6

7

8

Religions call for a man to free himself from desires because it will improve understanding. But the desire to free oneself from desires is also undesirable, that is why this process cannot be accelerated. And why do that? I do not think that the bubbles of understanding that are in the incomprehensible are in a hurry to go somewhere.

One of the amazing examples of distortion of the entire meaning for the sake of clearness is the transformation of Christ's teaching into a teaching about "love." A revolution happened because one word was taken out of context. What love do our Christians talk about if Jesus Christ called for people to be indifferent toward one's own life, well-being, desires and to treat others in the same way as oneself?

The samurais of Middle Age Japan were far from empty theorizing. Constant risk forced them to select the most efficacious for themselves. But they also thought that during a duel the best state for a fencer is not to desire anything and to think of nothing. He should not want to win or to lose or to move or not to move. It was considered that in this state, which was called mu-sin, a warrior acts more effectively. A great fencer Dzyagu Tadzima-no-kami Munenori wrote that a warrior should get rid of the following obsessions:

1) a desire to win;
2) a desire to resort to technical tricks;
3) a desire to demonstrate everything you have learned, everything you know;
4) a desire to make you opponent fear;
5) a desire to play a passive role;
6) a desire to get rid of an illness to which you are most likely susceptible;

one of the aforementioned.

If a fencer becomes possessed by at least one of these ideas, he loses his freedom, and that is extremely undesirable for his profession.

A man has two worlds at the same time which are closely connected with each other. But if one stops the mental dialogue and weakens the connection between them, an opportunity to change the physical worlds will arise and at the same time the conceptual world will play a role of an anchor, allowing one to return. Probably essences, while accumulating understanding, change worlds until they lose the necessity to create them. Besides, it is possible that some worlds common for some number of essences in time stop fulfilling their purpose and should be substituted, but then there is an end of the world for each world.

Can you imagine that something happens not according to the rules, that is, completely without rules? Because physical laws, known and unknown, must impose their will on everything, living and inanimate. And we can throw up an apple as much as we want and it will always fall onto the ground. But if it will suddenly hang in mid-air, we will be able to offer only three possible explanations: either the laws became different although they remained to be laws, or the conditions of the experiment changed and some additional forces that act on the apple appeared, or that these are all just hallucinations. There can be no other explanation. An atheist cannot imagine an apple hanging in the air in the conditions of unchanging experience. For a believer it is easier since he as a reserve has an additional reason for everything – God's will.

Studying the behavior of elementary particles we can only predict the probability of one event or another. That is each individual event is accidental and given unchanging initial conditions it can be of any kind. And it already does not surprise anyone, although if the apple were to hang in the air where it deemed necessary, without any rules, then everyone would probably cross himself more than once. It is interesting how we arranged – once we make up a name for something, for example, an accident, we then think of it as an

explanation. Besides, the word “accidental” is often applied to an event that is difficult to predict because of a large number of influencing factors; but that is not true.

Those who adhere to materialism commit a crime against common sense when with a smug grin, which for some reason is typical of them, expatiate on their unbelief in God’s will, karma, etc. They say that they believe in physical reasons for everything that happens. But then even this thought could not be their own thought, it would have appeared as a result of some physical processes in the organism, independently of these individuals. In that way, a mechanical-physical-chemical person would not be able to understand himself, just as a roadside cobblestone cannot do it. And because you think of your actions and thoughts as your own, that is, you think that you have some influence over them, it can only mean that something interferes in the control over processes that occur in your body, something without which you are not an individual. And this something is called a soul. This conclusion is quite logical, and is at least much more logical that the reasoning of materialists who think that they can have influence over their actions and thoughts, and then immediately try to prove that everything is controlled by the laws of nature that are beyond their control. That is absurd. One can be a materialist by habit, not thinking, but it is impossible to be a thoughtful materialist.

Thus, by means of simple reflection, assuming free will, we will come to the conclusion that the soul or something similar to it exists. And that is what all the religions of the world are based on. That is, it is the soul that controls all the processes that take place in the organism. But in order to do this, the soul must know what is happening around it. At the same time, the soul cannot use the senses since their testimony depends on itself. Therefore, the soul must in some way have an influence over everything around it, absolutely everything. One can even say the following: the entire world and we ourselves are created by the soul-essence of each of us. I will not discuss this thought here, but in my other pieces I examine it in more detail.

Thus, the essence of each of us creates ourselves and the world around us, in which other living creatures are reflections-symbols of other beings. And if the creation of a world were a purpose in itself for an essence, then no one would ever die, that is, the worlds wouldn’t change. Therefore, the creation of the worlds is simply the means for achieving something else for essences. Possibly, the same essence creates different worlds one after another, where it itself appears as different creatures. In this case, one can talk about the transmigration of souls. But if the essence creates the world not for the sake of the worlds themselves, then for the sake of what? And may be what the essence strives for lies outside of these worlds, may be they, the worlds, are just scaffolding that is burned after the entire building is built. And the less a person is absorbed and dragged into the world in which he lives, the closer his soul-essence is to the goal that he tries to reach. Bhagavad-Gita says “One who equally does not strive for his activity to bear fruits and does not despise these fruits, is considered to always be in renunciation. Such a person, free from any duality, easily casts off his materialistic claims and becomes completely free, o strong-arm Ardjun.”

The achievement of deliverance from the chains of reincarnation – moksha – is considered to be the highest religious purpose in Hinduism. And spiritual reality – Brahman – is proclaimed to be the highest foundation of existence. It is considered that the true meaning of life lies in understanding of this absolute, in merging of an individual soul with Brahman which are one by nature but are considered to be independent by most of the believers because of their ignorance.